DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 340 671 SP 033 437

AUTHOR Haberman, Martin
TITLE The Dimensions of Excellence in Programs of Teacher Education.
PUB DATE Apr 91
NOTE 46p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference on Alternative Certification (1st, South Padre Island, TX, April 10-12, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Alternative Teacher Certification; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Criteria; Experiential Learning; Field Instruction; Higher Education; Knowledge Level; Maturity (Individuals); Methods Courses; On the Job Training; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Effectiveness; Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS Excellence (Quality)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this publication is to examine five standards of excellence for judging teacher education programs. The paper is organized into five sections with the standards stated as questions and summarized as guidelines. The five questions discussed are: (1) What are the attributes sought in those selected to become teachers? (2) What is the nature of the expertise of those who serve as teacher educators? (3) What knowledge is of most worth for future teachers? (4) What is the best way of offering this knowledge? and (5) What are the effects of the program on new teachers and the pupils they serve? Twenty-three guidelines of excellence, to be applied to programs of teacher education, are suggested. These guidelines include: developmental level adults are the best constituency to prepare for teaching; teacher educators should be experienced, effective, and currently practicing classroom teachers; the knowledge base which undergirds most teacher practice is experiential; teacher education should occur on-site in a functioning school and be coached by an effective classroom teacher. According to this paper, these guidelines are difficult to find in traditional university-based teacher education programs; they can, however, be found in some alternative certification programs. (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. Haberman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Dimensions of Excellence in Programs of Teacher Education

Martin Haberman
School of Education
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
April, 1991

Keynote Address to the First Annual Conference on Alternative Certification, South Padre Island, Texas.

There are essentially five standards for judging the quality of teacher education programs. Rather than lay out these guidelines in the way they are usually dealt with--as minimum standards--I will state and amplify them as maximum levels--as standards of excellence. In this way we shall be helped to deal with the nature of what we should be striving for in the preparation of teachers and not merely with the usual question of how weak does a teacher education program have to become before we close it down.

These standards deal with the nature of those selected to become teachers, who are the teacher educators, the content offered, the ways in which the content is offered, and evaluation. These standards are stated as guidelines at the conclusion of each section and summarized at the end. To begin this review of excellence, I will discuss the standards as five questions to be answered:

1. Selection - What are the attributes sought in those selected to be teachers and how does the selection process assess these qualities?
2. Faculty - What is the nature of the expertise of those who serve as teacher educators?
3. Content - What are the knowledge, behaviors, beliefs, attitudes and values the teachers-to-be are expected to learn?
4. Method - How, by what means, are these contents best learned? and

5. Evaluation - What are the effects of the program on the new teachers it prepares and the pupils they serve?

What are the Attributes Sought in Those Selected to Become Teachers?

In typical programs of teacher education there are multiple criteria of admission: several are bureaucratic hoops, a few are real. At this writing 35 states require a basic skills test usually covering reading, language usage, and math skills. All universities consider GPA and some add the completion of particular courses (e.g., Speech), personal interviews, faculty references, and personal statements, most typically, "Why I Want to Be a Teacher." Except for the states' skills tests and GPA, almost all other criteria are essentially fluff. The critical question that cuts through the selection morass in university-based teacher education is a simple one: "On what basis might your institution keep someone with a high GPA out of teaching?" This simple question is usually met with shock, embarrassment, or worse, a war story of how a bright student changed his/her own mind about becoming a teacher after s/he was admitted and screened him/herself out. Since the answer in almost every case is that there are no systematic, regular means for screening students with high GPAs out of teacher education programs, traditional university-based programs must admit that their operational criterion (apart from the skills tests mandated

by the state) is GPA. Everything else is an add-on which is readily accomplished or brushed aside by a high GPA.

There is nothing wrong and much to be desired by having people who have done well in college courses becoming teachers. The problem is that once people reach the level of doing well enough to graduate from the university, the distinctions between "good" and "high" GPAs become spurious. In my own institution, which has enrollment caps, students with GPAs of 3.1 are excluded in favor of students with GPAs of 3.2 and above. In other semesters, depending on the number of applicants, the cut-off GPA might be even higher than 3.1. And if the issue of spuriousness were not sufficient, there is another "minor" matter. GPA does not correlate with teaching performance. Indeed, some evidence indicates there is an inverse relationship between SAT scores and students' level of development as adults (Sprinthall & Sprinthall, 1987).

The irrefutable point is that university-based teacher education is held hostage to GPA in spite of the fact that once people do well enough to graduate the distinctions made between minor gradations in GPA or the attempt to extrapolate from GPA to practice are witchcraft. The question of why university-based teacher education persists in this hokum and refers to it as selection is that university-based teacher education occurs in contexts which are divorced from the real world and contradictory in their demands (Corrigan &

Haberman, 1990). Another factor which precludes genuine selection is the reality that budgets in schools and colleges of Education are based on the number of student credit hours generated and it would be self-destructive for them to get serious about selection. A genuine standard of excellence would involved assessing a candidate's ability to interrelate with children) before s/he is admitted to teacher education. Schools of education reject this standard because it is expensive, labor intensive, and might keep out students who generate student credit hours. But the reason they give for rejecting the standard is something else. University based programs perpetuate the myth that the programs they offer are sufficiently potent to change their students in important ways, i.e., sexists may enter but emerge being able to teach science and math to girls; racists may enter but will change their perceptions and expectations for students of color; child abusers who believe corporal punishment shapes character will change their practices and values. But we know better. The claim that a sequence of courses in a university-based teacher education will change students' deep-seated perceptions, beliefs, attitudes, and values, in addition to their knowledge and behaviors, is contrary to what we know about the feeble impact of teacher education on its graduates or their subsequent practice (Zeichner & Gore, 1990).

Let us consider some alternatives. There is a knowledge base upon which to select future teachers and there are procedures for implementing it. There are also selection procedures which, at the same time they raise admission standards increase the potential pool of applicants (Haberman, 1987). This new level of understanding, however, requires a basic shift in past assumptions made about who should be in teacher education programs. Future teachers need not automatically be defined as "students" since they need not be in a matriculated college/university program. Once the pool of future teachers is reconceptualized as college graduates, a variety of constituencies which have been neglected by traditional teacher education, but who are more qualified than traditional undergraduate youth, becomes available.

Able adults, many of whom will make superb teachers, are willing and able to define themselves in the role of teachers-in-training but are unwilling and uncomfortable with stepping back into the role of university student. With few exceptions, traditional teacher education is geared to undergraduate youth who are full-time. It responds to adults, even though they may be college graduates, as "retreads" and "specials." These denigrating titles are merely symptomatic of the underlying issue. The issue is that the faculty's assumptions about what a "student" is, how

a "student" behaves and how the institution treats "students" has completely subordinated and transformed the mission of preparing teacher practitioners into offering university programs as the paramount concern. Simply stated, there's nothing prerequisite in the role of being a university student to becoming a public school teacher since there's nothing relevant in the college student's role to subsequent teaching practice. Indeed, a strong case can be made that almost every aspect of university students' behavior and the expectations of university faculty regarding students are antithetic to the role of practicing teachers: dependence vs. independence, following directions vs. creating and managing one's own work; and completing a lock-step set of fixed requirements as preparation for dealing with children's individual growth and differences.

The simple truth is something quite different. Adult college graduates can be selected into teacher education who have both the proclivities and life experiences to become teachers. They should be screened not for the attributes that will make them successful university students but for the qualities that will make them excellent teachers of children and youth. These elementary points are fundamental to understanding why and how the current state of selection into traditional teacher education programs resists the potential for selecting the promising adults that school-based and site-based teacher education programs admit.

Without reviewing the arguments in-depth here, it is typical for Americans to reach the developmental level of adulthood after the age of 25 (in may cases after 30) and since most undergraduates in university-based teacher education programs are under 25, the students found in universities are essentially an inappropriate constituency to prepare for teaching. Teaching requires the level of maturity needed to be concerned about the development and nurturance of <u>others</u>; typically, late adolescent youth and young adults are appropriately concerned with the separation of <u>themselves</u> from parents and the development of their own identities (Haberman, 1990). Similar arguments can be made and supported by theory and research which demonstrates that the conceptual level of college youth are not yet fully developed and still too rigid to fulfill the role of teacher. The evidence is compelling because this conclusion is readily arrived at regardless of the development theory one uses (Pintrich, 1990).

There is also the consideration of who should do the selecting. For example, are university faculty the best group to select teachers? Considering that only 5% have ever taught in low-income or multicultural classrooms and less than 1% have done so longer than 3 years, the question of whether university faculty could identify a prospectively successful teacher if they saw one is a legitimate concern. Reasonableness would suggest that practicing classroom

teachers who are familiar with the daily demands of the teacher and the work of the teacher would be infinitely more suitable. If prospective teachers are to demonstrate they can relate to children/youth and go through interviews they might actually fail, then who are to be the interviewers? Good sense leads us to rely on experienced, successful classroom practitioners for such judgments.

In sum, there are at least four dimensions of excellence related to selection by which programs of teacher preparation can be held accountable.

1. Individuals who have reached the developmental level of adulthood are the best constituency to prepare for teaching.
2. The demonstrated ability to establish rapport with low income children/youth of diverse ethnic backgrounds is a necessary part of the selection process.
3. Teacher candidates should be assessed using valid and reliable interviews which predict their success.
4. Practicing classroom teachers recognized as effective by peers, students, administrators, and the state should be involved in making these selection decisions.

<u>What is the Nature of the Expertise of Those Who Serve as Teacher Educators?</u>

The ability to write articles for publication or to garner research grants has nothing to do with teachers'

ability to teach children/youth or to prepare others to do so. These are skills which are required by assistant professors who seek to become tenured in schools and colleges of Education. There can be no disagreement that publication and research are the criteria used by the "best" universities to reward and promote junior faculty. University-based teacher educators are first selected on the basis of having completed doctoral programs which generally have little or nothing to do with the real work of teachers. Anyone who reviews doctoral dissertations will be hard pressed to find studies that are in any way related to improving teaching and learning in real schools. And if such dissertation topics are found they will deal with extremely detailed analyses of very narrow aspects of the teachers' work, or with treatments that cannot be implemented in the real world. My own review of dissertation topics, which is quite current, is that less than one out of a hundred would affect the work of classroom teachers and then, in only some unimportant or adverse way. The reason for this is that senior professors who approve dissertation topics are largely unfamiliar with current teacher practices or the conditions under which teachers work. When they approve dissertations as contributions to the literature they do so on the basis of what's new to them. But what's new to the ignorant is not necessarily useful research.

We have a situation then which is a kind of dirty little secret. We wouldn't want the public or the taxpayers or the parents to learn too much about the expertise of our teacher educators since they naively believe that teacher educators in universities--by virtue of having doctorates--are knowledgeable experts of teaching and therefore the most appropriate people to prepare future teachers. Actually, the reverse is true. Teacher educators in universities have less teaching experience than in former years and increasing numbers, particularly in the burgeoning educational psychology subspecialties, have no teaching experience at all. It is not uncommon for even specialists in reading and other subjects taught in school to have less than three years of actual teaching experience. Many have spent their young lives as only graduate students and never taught. In sum, the typical pattern is for an ambitious individual who is good at "graduate school" to endure a very few years of classroom teaching--which may have been good or poor teaching--go through a doctoral program comprised of courses and requirements which are irrelevant to the practice of teachers in classrooms, complete a dissertation irrelevant to practice, and then become an Assistant Professor of Education training future teachers. Then, in this university role to be promoted for staying as far out of real schools as possible by a system which rewards professional activities in the following order: 1) research, 2) writing, 3) university

teaching, and 4) supervision in schools. Of those who would dispute my analysis I would ask the following simple questions:

1. Which admission criteria to which doctoral programs require evidence that the candidate was ever an effective teacher--even for one year?
2. Which doctoral programs adopt admission or exit requirements because they are relevant to the practice of teachers in the real world?
3. Which doctoral programs use relevance to the real world of practicing teachers as a criterion for judging doctoral students' comprehensive examinations or dissertation topics?
4. Which doctoral programs use "improving the practice of classroom teachers" as a criterion for approving dissertations?
5. Which universities hire new assistant professors as teacher educators on the basis that they themselves were effective teachers and assure them of promotion if they can, in turn, prepare effective teachers?

The answers to these questions are a thundering silence, hung heads, or lectures by School of Education Deans on the facts of university life. Who cares about the facts of university life? The issue is getting good teachers for America's children, not helping education professors survive in academe.

The time has come to call a halt to the pretense, fakery and hypocrisy of most university-based teacher education. It is largely self-serving, building large colleges for the conduct of activities deemed important to the administration and faculty with little or no relevance to preparing teachers for the real world.

Reasonable people begin with the needs of our children/youth for more and better teachers. The logic is quite straightforward. Successful teachers know best what teachers do. Successful teachers who have coached beginners are the best people to educate others. Successful teachers who are still practicing in classrooms are the most appropriate teacher educators since they are able to themselves demonstrate best practices. These are not difficult concepts to understand and they are readily agreed to by all constituencies except for those who personally benefit and profit from maintaining the fiction that teachers are prepared in universities by college faculty.

The criticisms I have made thus far are mild when one adds the dimension that we not only seek to prepare practicing teachers but practicing teachers for urban, low-income, and multicultural constituencies of diverse children/youth. Now, we can intensify my criticism to the third power. University faculty in schools of education are almost completely experience free of having successfully taught such children/youth. The very pupils and schools most

in need of teachers simply cannot get them from the professoriate in education unless you accept the following positions:

1. It is not necessary to have taught low-income or diverse pupils in order to prepare others to do so.
2. The doctoral programs of those who graduate and become Assistant Professors of Education emphasize practical knowledge for preparing teachers for diverse classrooms.
3. The universities which employ these assistant professors reward them for working in low income and diverse schools and classrooms.

Unless you make these outrageous contentions you can't argue that universities can prepare teachers for the real world and if you do make these contentions, you're either from another planet or impervious to reality.

The five principles of excellence which should define the expertise of faculty in programs of teacher education are as follows:

1. Since the essential expertise required of future teachers is relevant, usable, know-how in teaching children/youth, the majority of the teacher education faculty, in any program, should be experienced, currently practicing classroom teachers who have been identified as effective.
2. Teacher educators are practitioners whose scholarship derives primarily from an experiential knowledge base of

what works in classrooms in the real world; they are expert at evaluating ideas from whatever source (state mandates, expert opinion, administrative policy, research or theory) in terms of its effects on children/youth in classrooms.

3. Teacher educators are expert teachers of low-income, minority and culturally diverse constituencies of children/youth in need of the best teachers.
4. Teacher educators are capable of coaching candidates' actual teaching behavior and of modeling best practices for them.
5. Teacher educators are knowledgeable, currently practicing teachers who can prepare candidates for the non-teaching school-wide and community responsibilities of teachers in the real world.

What Knowledge is of Most Worth for Future Teachers?

There are five sources of knowledge available to teachers. They vary widely in their usefulness and hence the degree to which practicing teachers implement them. First is theory--usually learning theories of how people learn and developmental theories of how they grow. There are also theories which undergird why we have schools at all and what they are intended to accomplish. In no cases do public schools adopt a single theory and organize a school around it. If they did, teacher education would be relatively

simple since future teachers would be able to implement that one theory. Montessori came closest but then state mandates about required subjects, including physical education, demonstrated the unreasonableness of expecting that public education in our diverse society could be based on any single theory of development, learning or instruction.

The second source of school behavior is research. With the exception of findings from tests and measurement (i.e. how to administer, standardize and interpret tests) and behavior modification (which has become standard practice in teaching the retarded), research findings have not been widely or generally implemented in public schools. Indeed, a good case might be made that public schools operate as institutions based on traditions and laws which are generally contradicted by research. What research tells us about grouping and tracking is generally opposite to practice. Similarly with the values of preschool education, retention, corporal punishment, class size and cooperative learning. In general, school practices are refuted by research findings not supported by them. In most cases, however, this neglect of "evidence" as a basis of school practice is well advised since much that is included in the research literature is never replicated, is extremely narrow in its questions, uses standardized tests as <u>the</u> measure of learning and worst of all, is based on superficial treatments which may involve

children for as little as a few hours in an effort to validate some great new solution. For better and worse, school practices do not reflect educational research and if they did, it would be unlikely that the school that tried to function on such "science" would ever be explicable by its administrators, or livable by its teachers and children, let alone supported by the public.

The third source of knowledge available to teachers is common sense and folklore. This realm still holds great sway over daily practices in most schools. Everything from the school calendar, to what constitutes excused absences demonstrates a school culture in which almost all who have attended schools are expert. These traditions are so powerful that they overcome present forms of teacher education. That is, if we were to freeze teacher actions at a hundred points in any given school day, the reason the teacher would offer for why s/he engaged in a particular action would not be his/her teacher training. It would be an unthinking replication of his/her own school experiences, or what the teacher knows to be appropriate action in the particular school. Common sense and tradition can be valuable in that we can act in mutually supportive ways without having to constantly ask ourselves "why." It can also be extremely dangerous because we never question our assumptions. For example, why does Texas lead the nation

with 275,000 reported incidents of corporal punishment each year? How have these practices improved the quality of schooling in Texas? Common sense is dangerous because it supports negative and positive practices with equal vigor.

The fourth source of teacher knowledge is expert opinion. There are the varied experts with different systems of classroom discipline. In other cases we have expert advocates for systems of instruction: mastery learning, cooperative learning or the whole-language approach. The most notable example is Madelon Hunter's direct instruction which a few states have formally adopted as the way for teachers to teach. As in all systems of pedagogy, if the teachers who implement the method believe in it and adopt it wholeheartedly and enthusiastically, the method "works." At the same time, teachers who do not believe in the method or who implement it technically but not enthusiastically will have students who do not demonstrate the stated benefits of the instruction. There is no system of instruction that is teacher proof or conversely so weak that believing, committed teachers cannot use it successfully in some schools. This is not to say that some methods are not better than others but to point to the need for methods which are compatible with teachers' experience if there is to be genuine implementation. Finally, the fifth source of teacher knowledge is experiential; The cumulated experience of the

individual teacher and the experiences of others. This is craft knowledge. It is the most powerful source of what teachers do and it should be. The constraints on public schools and they are formidable, including state mandates, local administrative policies, finances, buildings, class size, curricular demands, parental expectations, community culture, and school bureaucracy, create working conditions which frequently prevent rather than facilitate good teaching and learning. More than thirty-three years ago a student teacher I worked with thanked me at the end of the semester by saying, "Thank you for preparing me for the best of all non-existent worlds?" I've been trying to do better ever since by recognizing the constraints real teachers face in real schools. What effective teachers utilize every hour of every day is a persistent form of problem solving based on a few ethical commitments. They believe their children/youth can learn and they believe schooling is the major force in influencing their life chances. This makes their day-to-day work as teachers a moral craft founded on ethical commitments. The following are merely a few of the daily questions practicing teachers ask themselves. As you consider them, reflect upon the source of knowledge you would rely on most to cope with and resolve these issues? Would you expect theory, research, common sense, expert opinion, or your own experience as a teacher and the experiences of other

teacher practitioners to provide you with the most useful guidelines for working through these problems? Remember, the proposed solutions will be judged on the basis of working in specific situations and contexts: "my" school, "my" class, "my" students.

- How can I deal with a large class of students that varies widely in terms of ability, effort, achievement and interest?
- How can I plan and gather instructional materials when I have insufficient time and resources?
- How can I engage, interest and motivate my children from low economic families and from diverse cultural and language backgrounds to learn a common curriculum?
- How can I make learning in my class relevant to my youngsters' life experiences?
- How can I get youngsters in my class who have been brutalized by repeated school failure to keep trying?
- How can I maintain a positive, supportive class climate while managing several disruptive youngsters with serious problems?
- How can I cover the required curriculum and help all the youngsters who are so far behind?

- How can I work with community professionals in health and social services to help the youngsters in my class?
- How can I involve my low-income parents of diverse backgrounds to cooperate in ways which support the work in my class? How can I learn from these parents?
- How can I teach more to youngsters who change schools several times a year?
- How can I help the several abused youngsters in my class to concentrate on their work?
- How can I help those in my class who need health care and better nutrition?
- How can I teach without science and art materials, or sufficient books, let alone no computers or software?

In sum, the knowledge that is of most worth for those preparing to teach can best be identified by reference to the following guidelines.

1. The knowledge base which undergirds most teacher practice is experiential. What works is derived primarily from the cumulative experience of effective practitioners.
2. The best practice of teachers is heavily influenced by the contexts in which the teaching occurs and the

constraints which control best practice vary in different situations.

3. Research, theory, expert opinion and common sense can inform teacher practice but not provide the major basis for such practice because of the critical importance of constraints which vary across situations.
4. There is no basis for assuming that completing doctoral study in traditional Education specialties, or teaching in university Schools of Education will provide adequate preparation or reward for functioning as a teacher educator.
5. Those with the most potential as teacher educators are those with the most useful knowledge for new teachers: effective classroom teachers currently implementing such best practice with low-income and culturally diverse students.

What is the Best Way of Offering this Knowledge to Teachers?

I won't comment in detail on offering university courses as a means of teaching people to teach. There is substantial evidence from students in such programs, recent graduates and experienced teachers regarding the lack of substance and irrelevance of such coursework. I would like to focus instead on student teaching which these same constituencies single out as being of immense value and advocating more of.

Being against student teaching is somewhat like coming out against apple pie and baseball but rather than the sine qua non of teacher education it is actually a flawed model which perpetuates mediocrity and guarantees fewer and poorer teachers for low-income and diverse youngsters. Assuming the basic elements of student teaching practice are commonly known, I would limit my criticisms here to merely the following flaws:

1. Student teacher numbers are driven by the number of students that a university admits to metriculation and then needs to place in schools not by the number of master teachers available. As enrollments in universities go up student teachers must inevitably be placed with less adequate cooperating teachers. Students in universities are not about to delay their graduations in order to wait a year or so and work with a better cooperating teacher. The numbers of experienced, effective teachers, particularly in the small towns and rural areas where most universities are located makes the placement of students with poor teachers a common, indeed, typical practice.
2. Student teachers do not learn to accurately assess their own abilities. If they teach in the room of an able cooperating teacher who has established a positive learning environment, they will perceive of themselves as more able than they really are. The reverse is also

true. Their self analysis must inevitably be inaccurate and hence their ability to develop as teachers is seriously impaired.

3. The number of those screened out by student teaching is fewer than should be the case because of the concern for students and their "rights" in the university rather than the "rights" of children and youth to have adequate teachers.

4. The faculty assigned to supervise have frequently been out of teaching for long periods or may not have taught at all; almost all are irrelevant in their ability to respond to the demands of children in low-income and culturally diverse schools. In many universities doctoral students are drafted to serve as university supervisors. In other places most ad-hoc faculty are used as supervisors.

5. Connections between the theory and research offered in university coursework and the practices experienced by student teachers in real schools are rarely made because they are not complementary.

6. Many cooperating teachers are selected by their principals as individuals who might themselves be helped or updated by having a student teacher.

7. Student teachers are visited half a dozen times or less by college supervisors. As a result students tend to reinforce their stereotypes because they are not closely

guided and debriefed about what they are observing and how they interpret what they are seeing. Those who are sexist or racist or hold negative stereotypes about any constituency, selectively perceive what they are predisposed to see and emerge from student teaching as more hardened than when they began. They say, in effect, "I always knew these kids were dirty, or violent, or uninterested in learning and now I've seen it for myself first-hand!" Without daily expensive, individualized guided observation, direct experiences need not be liberating or educative. They can confirm quite inaccurate beliefs and harden them into the bases for negative generalizations.

8. Student teaching focuses on subject matter: usually reading and math skills in the lower grades and the particular school subjects taught in middle grades and secondary schools. The major job of learning to teach, however, is in learning to deal with the pupils themselves, to manage and organize them and to make learning meaningful in their lives. Student teaching inevitably focuses on "the lesson" and not on the conditions of teaching in the particular school or the conditions of pupils' lives, both of which control the classroom situation to a greater degree than the abstract concept of "the lesson." <u>The issue is not</u>

teaching reading but teaching Mary to read in this class in this school in this community given the teacher's conditions of work.

9. Student teaching emphasizes learning to do well as judged by external observers rather than trying to solve problems for which one is personally responsible. Problem solving inevitably involves some failure and some risk. Such behavior is incompatible with trying to make an A or secure a glowing reference. Practice teaching makes good practice teachers. Only functioning in the role of a real teacher can prepare one to assume real responsibility.

10. Student teachers are shielded from the bureaucratic demands of working in schools, record keeping, duties, staff meetings, parent meetings and community involvements. Since the law prevents students from assuming these responsibilities or even observing many of the most critical ones (e.g. a staff meeting placing a child in a special class), students are precluded from knowing, let alone practicing, some of the teachers most difficult responsibilities.

These shortcomings and numerous others which I won't burden you with, preclude student teaching from being an authentic participation in the full role of the teacher. In the absence of such a full picture student teachers can

neither learn to teach or to assess their own strengths and weaknesses by virtue of having "had" the experience.

If neither university courses nor student teaching prepares people to teach what does? Essentially, I have already discussed three of the necessary elements: selecting adults, using relevant practitioners as faculty and offering content derived from successful teachers experiences. After these it is necessary to add the fourth element of on-site coaching.

Coaching differs from supervision in several fundamental ways. Traditional supervision involves setting people to teach some lessons, observing them, then conferencing with them immediately afterward on the strengths and weaknesses of what was observed. Coaching involves showing how and delaying discussion until after the experienced teacher-coach demonstrates. What is then analyzed are the strengths and weaknesses of the experienced teacher's performance and the neophyte's plans for the next trial. In 76 out of 78 studies of traditional supervision, there was little or no change in the trainee's behavior (Joyce, 1987). Coaching, on the other hand, contributes to the transfer of training in several ways.

1. Coached teachers are more willing to practice new strategies.
2. Coached teachers use new strategies more appropriately and share them with other teachers.

3. Coached teachers retain and improve their new techniques over time.
4. Coached teachers teach new ideas to others and
5. Coached teachers have clear ideas of why they do what they do (Joyce & Showers, 1988).

It is essential that this coaching occur as the neophyte is in the fully responsible role of teacher not student teacher. Coaching and showing how can then cover the gamut of teacher responsibilities. In contrast to the 10 weaknesses of student teaching cited earlier, the neophyte in the role of practitioner-with-coach is fully responsible and therefore made fully aware of his/her strengths and weaknesses. Practice can now be implemented in the full range of tasks performed by real teachers in the real world. "How can I enhance the learning of these youngsters in this classroom in this school in this community under these specific restraints becomes the continuing, persistent question which undergirds all of the neophyte's work. It is the full-day, concentrated attention by the beginner and his/her coach to these issues that is the means by which the teacher education program is actually delivered.

The principles of excellence which should guide the offering of substantive content in teacher education programs are as follows:

1. Teacher education occurs on-site in a functioning school. Under ideal conditions, teachers are hired to teach in the very schools in which they are prepared. This enables them to maximize a preparation which is inevitably controlled by the conditions of work and restraints in a particular school.
2. Teachers-to-be learn to teach by functioning in the role of teacher and being held responsible for the full-range of tasks and duties required of other practicing teachers.
3. Teaching is taught best by a process of coaching when the coach is a practicing teacher released from his/her own classroom to coach a few beginners on a full-time basis.
4. Teacher education programs are enhanced and supplemented by workshops offered to meet beginning teachers particular needs; such workshops are offered by other teachers, community resource people and carefully selected university faculty.
5. Traditional university courses may be of some use to teachers <u>after</u> they have had a few years of teaching practice and have developed the experiential knowledge-base for evaluating what is being offered them.

What Are the Effects of the Program on the New Teachers it Prepares and the Pupils they Serve?

Teaching and preparing to teach operate on a continuum of difficulty. If a teacher can be effective in a difficult situation s/he can readily teach in an advantaged one, but the converse is not true. By "difficulty" I refer to the degree of complexity in the teaching situation, the bureaucratic demands placed on teachers, the nature of their constraints, the conditions of work, the degree of unmet social, health and educational needs faced by their pupils and parents, and most of all, the amount of know-how required by teachers to be effective given these cumulated demands on them. For this reason, all teachers should be prepared in the most demanding situations if teacher licenses continue to be valid in all types of schools. There is a substantial and growing basis for believing that teachers prepared in small town and suburban schools cannot function in schools serving diverse groups in poverty. University-based teacher education programs and state licensing bureaus need to catch up with what the graduates they certify demonstrate they already know but which the licensing system refuses to acknowledge. It is not chance that 70% of the teacher education graduates in Wisconsin do not take jobs. It is not chance that the number of applicants in some suburbs and small towns go as high as 1,000 per opening. In Minnesota

the figure of non-employed graduates is 68% and in many other states the numbers are comparable. It is not chance that concurrent with this oversupply the 120 largest school districts in America serving approximately ten million students scramble to cover classrooms and with short periods of exception, have been short of teachers since 1800. The basic contention of this essay is that this simultaneous shortage and oversupply is not a historical accident, or the whimsical preferences of beginners, or chance, or in any way unexplainable. It reflects a systematic, pervasive, historic and continuing unresponsiveness by universities and schools of Education, Education faculty and the traditional constituencies of those who seek to become teachers to the educational needs of poor children, minorities, those with handicapping conditions and those in urban areas. It is not an accident that for a period of over 100 years we used normal schools to prepare teachers for small town and white America and left the major urban areas to develop their own normal schools and teacher training. For this reason many urban school districts (between approximately 1840 and WW II) paid for and operated their own district controlled normal schools while the state paid for "regular" institutions which later evolved into state colleges and universities while district normal schools languished and closed for lack of funds. The current practices in alternative certification in many states are not new developments in the sense that urban

schools have historically been outside the mainstream of university-based teacher education. It is now incredible to me and ought to be a source of concern to fair-minded people everywhere, that university-based teacher education which has an almost perfect history of intentionally turning its back on first children of the London slums, then on the millions of European ethnics who settled in urban areas and more recently on the children of color, the poor and bilingual, to now take the role of being outraged that they are being circumvented. It is university-based teacher education which has run away from the responsibility of preparing teachers for the poor and not school districts who have rejected universities. Even as we approach the year 2000 I see little understanding or contrition on the part of those responsible for traditional teacher education. School of Education leaders and faculty still respond to the needs of the poor and diverse cultural groups by stonewalling. Instead of admitting irrelevance and seeking to do better they still raise questions like, "what's different about urban teaching, or teaching the poor, or diverse populations?" "What's urban math, 2+2=5?" The circle-the-wagons mentality and the fear they demonstrate is the clearest recognition there can be that they know their doctoral training and their expertise is irrelevant and therefore the positions they hold are largely undeserved. If one's knowledge as an expert in learning, or

teaching or administration is recognized by one's students, the public and practicing teachers as irrelevant to almost half the children in America how does one justify being a professor, or a dean or being employed by a school of Education? It is this threat to their very bona fides that will make most of the 45,000 Education professors and their deans resist to the death the admission that university-based teacher education cannot prepare teachers for the poor and for cultural diversity. And without this admission as an absolute prerequisite initial requirement, university-based teacher education cannot generate the logical platform to restructure itself. The university-based teacher educators of America can prove me wrong quite readily. All they have to do is start preparing effective teachers who will stay for longer than a year or two in the schools where they are needed. It's quite a straightforward solution.

My expectation is that the reverse will occur. Traditional teacher education will become increasingly irrelevant and disconnected from the schools where teachers are most needed and the growth of school-based, district controlled teacher education will continue to burgeon. Indeed, my expectation is that the development of school-based teacher education will become so common that shrinking state budgets and public scrutiny will make many states consider teacher certification voluntary for college graduates in districts which choose to hire them and leave to

those school districts the total responsibility for preparing their own teachers. I now advise doctoral students who express an interest in teacher education to prepare for careers in large public school districts or in regional consortia of public schools which will serve many smaller districts.

Evaluation in traditional university-based programs is based primarily on the feedback of graduates. What we learn from such evaluation are generalizations such as: there should have been longer periods of student teaching, less and more relevant coursework and a separate course in discipline. An objective evaluation reveals quite clearly that universities have developed systems and policies for offering courses, grouping such courses into departments, matching the courses with state requirements and then using courses to make up faculty teaching loads. There has been little if any thought given to conceptualizing a program and then defining clear program objectives and evaluations. But in the university courses are never conceived of as means; they are ends! As a result, gathering the perceptions of graduates and cooperating teachers to evaluate "programs" is essentially meaningless. There are no university "programs" only courses or sequences of courses.

Genuine evaluation of a teacher education program, in addition to the four elements discussed previously, should

consider the effectiveness of the beginning teachers' work with children and youth--including the children's learning. Obviously, this criterion cannot be employed if those certified never practice or cannot be followed-up.

The following guidelines should be used in evaluating a teacher education program:

1. Those admitted to a program of teacher education are selected on criteria which predict subsequent effectiveness with children/youth of low-income and cultural diversity.
2. The educators of teachers are recognized as effective and current teacher practitioners.
3. The content of the program offered is essentially derived from craft experience, supported by relevant research, theory and expert opinion.
4. The essential process of teacher education involves on-site coaching by an effective classroom teacher.
5. The quality of programs as determined by the above guidelines must be supplemented by analyses of the behavior of individual beginning teachers and the learning of pupils in their classes. Observations should be made by on-site teacher educators. Children's learning should include, but not be limited to, standardized test scores.

Summary

The guidelines of excellence which should be applied to programs of teacher education are as follows:

I. Selection of Candidates

1. Individuals who have reached the developmental level of adulthood are the best constituency to prepare for teaching.
2. The demonstrated ability to establish rapport with low income children/youth of diverse ethnic backgrounds is a necessary part of the selection process.
3. Teacher candidates should be assessed using valid and reliable interviews which predict their success.
4. Practicing classroom teachers recognized as effective by peers, students, administrators, and the state should be involved in making these selection decisions.

II. Teacher Educators

5. Since the essential expertise required of future teachers is relevant, usable, know-how in teaching children/youth, the majority of the teacher education faculty, in any program, should be experienced, currently practicing classroom teachers who have been identified as effective.

6. Teacher educators are practitioners whose scholarship derives primarily from an experiential knowledge base of what works in classrooms in the real world; they are expert at evaluating ideas from whatever source (state mandates, expert opinion, administrative policy, research or theory) in terms of its effects on children/youth in classrooms.
7. Teacher educators are expert teachers of low-income, minority and other constituencies of children/youth in need of the best teachers.
8. Teacher educators are capable of coaching candidates' actual teaching behavior and of modeling best practices for them.
9. Teacher educators are knowledgeable, currently practicing teachers who can prepare candidates for the non-teaching school-wide and community responsibilities of teachers in the real world.

III. Content

10. The knowledge base which undergirds most teacher practice is experiential. What works is derived primarily from the cumulative experience of effective practitioners.

11. The best practice of teachers is heavily influenced by the contexts in which the teaching occurs and the constraints which control best practice vary in different situations.
12. Research, theory, expert opinion and common sense can inform teacher practice but not provide the major basis for such practice because of the most critical importance of constraints which vary across situations.
13. There is no basis for assuming that completing doctoral study in traditional Education Specialties, or teaching in university schools of Education will provide adequate preparation or reward for functioning as a teacher educator.
14. Those with the most potential as teacher educators are those with the most useful knowledge for new teachers: effective classroom teachers currently implementing such best practice with low-income and culturally diverse students.

IV. Organized Offering of Content

15. Teacher education occurs on-site in a functioning school. Under ideal conditions teachers are hired to teach in the very schools in which they are prepared. This enables them to maximize a

preparation which is inevitably controlled by the conditions of work and restraints in a particular school.

16. Teachers-to-be learn to teach by functioning in the role of teacher and being held accountable for the full range of tasks and duties required of other practicing teachers.

17. Teaching is best taught by a process of coaching when the coach is a practicing teacher released from his/her own classroom to coach a few beginners on a full-time basis.

18. Teacher education programs are enhanced and supplemented by workshops offered to meet particular needs of beginning teachers; such workshops are offered by other teachers, community resource people and selected university faculty.

V. Evaluation

19. Those admitted to a program of teacher education are selected on criteria which predict subsequent effectiveness with children and youth of low income and cultural diversity.

20. The educators of teachers are recognized as effective and current teacher practitioners.

21. The content of the program offered is essentially derived from craft experience, supported by relevant research, theory and expert opinion.
22. The essential process of teacher education involves on-site coaching by an effective classroom teacher.
23. The quality of programs as determined by the above guidelines must be supplemented by analyses of the behavior of individual beginning teachers and the learning of pupils in their classes. Observations should be made by on-site teacher educators. Children's learning should include, but not be limited to, standardized test scores.

These 23 criteria are difficult if not impossible to find in traditional university-based teacher education programs. They can, however, be found in some Alternative Certification Programs. With their eyes firmly fixed on a past that never was, the schools and colleges of education are reeling backwards into a future that is beyond their wildest imagination. The choice they have is to continue an easy, unthinking tradition or to completely revise: one is easy but ruinous, the other is hard but productive. The wrong road at first seems familiar, it is smooth and lies close by but in the end it is very hard, hard to keep going

and hard to trace back. In front of excellence the road is rough and very steep at first but when you get to the heights it is exhilarating and a joy to keep going.

References

Corrigan, D. C. & Haberman, M. (1990). The Context of Teacher Education in W. R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education. New York: MacMillan, Chapter 12.

Haberman, M. (1990). The Rationale for Training Adults as Teachers, in C. Sleeter (Ed.), Empowerment through multicultural education. Albany: SUNY Press

Haberman, M. (1987). Recruiting and selecting teachers in urban schools. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Joyce, B. (1987). Essential reform in teacher education in L. Newton, M. Fullan & J. W. MacDonald (Eds.), Rethinking teacher education (pp. 1-27). Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Joyce B. & Showers, B. (1988). Student achievement through staff development (pp. 88-89). New York: Longman.

Pintrich, P. R. (1990). Implications of psychological research on student learning and college teaching for

teacher education, (ch. 47). Handbook of research on teacher education. New York: MacMillan.

Thies-Sprinthall, L., & Sprinthall, N. A. (1987). Experienced teachers: Agents for revitalization and renewal as mentors and teacher educators. Journal of Education, 169(1), 65-77.

Zeichner, K. M., & Gore, J. M. (1990). Teacher socialization in W. R. Houston (Ed.). Handbook of research on teacher education (ch. 19). New York: MacMillan.

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
1701 NORTH CONGRESS AVENUE
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701-1491

APRIL 1991